

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 17-22, 25, 32, 40- 42, 59, 62, 63, 71 and 96-98 were pending in this application. In the Office Action dated July 21, 2010, claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 17-22, 25, 32, 40- 42, 59, 62, 63, 71 and 96-98 were rejected.

Claims 1, 20, 22 and 59 are hereby amended to more specifically recite aspects of claimed invention. Claim 19 is hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are hereby respectfully requested.

### **Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement**

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement including additional materials for consideration is submitted herewith. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate consideration of these materials in the next communication to Applicant.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 17-22, 25, 32, 40- 42, 59, 62, 63, 71 and 96-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2007/0041545 (“Gainsboro”), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0091028 (“Chang”), U.S. Patent No. 5,883,945 (“Richardson”), U.S. Patent No. 7,333,798 (“Hodge”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,985,478 (“Pogossiants”). The rejections of claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 25, 32, 40- 42, 59, 62, 63, 71 and 96-98 are overcome in view of the amendments. Claim 19 is canceled herein; and therefore, the rejection of this claim is now obviated.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recite the feature of “a billing system co-located with said call application management system and located remotely from the call processing

gateways, the billing system connected to the call application management system for providing accounting of the calls . . . .” The billing system of claim 1 is co-located with a call application management system but located remotely from call processing gateways at prison facilities.

This feature is advantageous, among other reasons, because the need to provide equipments for billing at each prison facility may be obviated. By removing duplicative deployment of equipments, the cost associated with billing operations can be reduced.

None of the cited references disclose this feature. In Gainsboro, billing operation is performed at ITS-II that involves database at each correctional facility. See ¶¶ [0068] – [0069]. Specifically, Gainsboro states that “Database records are kept for each inmate, containing information on the inmate’s calling history, calling permissions, billing accounts, etc. *Each correctional facility system maintains this database information* for each inmate at that facility . . . .” See ¶ [0069]. Since each facility system individually maintains the database information, the system of Gainsboro appears to use a billing system installed at each correctional facility. That is, in Gainsboro does not perform centralized billing for multiple correctional facilities at a system remote from the correction facilities. Therefore, Gainsboro fails to disclose that the feature of “a billing system co-located with said call application management system and located remotely from the call processing gateways, the billing system connected to the call application management system for providing accounting of the calls,” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over Gainsboro.

Chang does not remedy the deficient disclosure of Gainsboro. Chang was cited in the Office Action merely for allegedly disclosing gateways to collect VoIP data packets associated with calls to multiple facilities. Nowhere in Chang does it disclose anything

about performing billing operations at a centralized system remote from prison facilities.

Richardson also fails to disclose this feature. Richardson at best discloses detecting three-way calls at a three-way call detection and response system 10 located outside a PSN 16 at a location distant from a calling party and a called party's end office switches 23, 29. Nowhere in Richardson does it disclose that the three-way call detection and response system 10 performs any billing or account management operations. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over Richardson.

Hodge and Pogossiants also fail to disclose this feature. Hodge and Pogossiants were cited in the Office Action merely for allegedly disclosing a justice application system and a session initiation protocol (SIP), respectively. Hodge and Pogossiants fail to disclose anything about performing billing operations at a centralized system remote from prison facilities.

Therefore, none of the cited references disclose the feature of "a billing system co-located with said call application management system and located remotely from the call processing gateways, the billing system connected to the call application management system for providing accounting of the calls," as recited in claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over Gainsboro, Chang, Richardson, Hodge and Pogossiants.

Claims 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 25, 32, 40-42 and 96 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 25, 32, 40-42 and 96 are also patentably distinguishable over Gainsboro, Chang, Richardson, Hodge and Pogossiants.

Independent claim 59, as amended, also recites the feature of "the plurality of prison facilities located remotely from the call processing system . . . the call processing system performing billing operations associated with the calls." Therefore, similar arguments set

forth above for claim 1 are also applicable to claim 59 and its dependent claims 62, 63, 71 and 97-98.

Claims 1 and 59 were also rejected as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 7,505,406 (“Spadaro”). This rejection is overcome in view of the amendments.

As set forth above, independent claim 1, as amended, recites the feature of “a billing system co-located with said call application management system and located remotely from the call processing gateways, the billing system connected to the call application management system for providing accounting of the calls . . . .” Spadaro, however, fails to disclose anything about billing. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over Spadaro.

Claim 59 also recites a similar feature as set forth above, and therefore, claim 59 is also patentably distinguishable over Spadaro.

All pending claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: October 18, 2010

/Dohyun Ahn/  
Dohyun Ahn, Reg. No. 63,237  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7291  
Fax: (650) 938-5200